

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 - 3, 7 - 9, and 17 - 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,295,133 ("Bloomquist"). The Examiner also objected to claims 4 - 6 as being dependent upon a rejected based claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicant sincerely appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. The Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 7, and 17, cancelled claims 3, 4, 8, and 18, and added new claim 41. The Applicant submits the following arguments in favor of patentability.

Returning to the Examiner's previous Office Action mailed July 1, 2008, the Applicant points out that the Examiner restricted claims 1 - 40 as a combination and subcombination having four groups of claims (i.e., group I including the combination claims 1 - 9 and 17 - 19, group II including the subcombination claims 10 - 16, 20 - 26, and 35 to 40, group III including the subcombination claims 27 - 31, and group IV including the subcombination claims 32 - 34). The Applicant elected the group I set of claims as required and respectfully traversed the Examiner's restriction. The Examiner, however, does not address the Applicant's traversal with this new Office Action as stated in M.P.E.P. § 821.01. The Applicant respectfully requests a new Office Action that explicitly states the Examiner's reasons for a restriction in view of the Applicant's well reasoned traversal that specifically points out the errors in the Examiner's restriction requirement.

For the Examiner's benefit, the Applicant again points out that the Examiner has stated that "the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed." The Applicant assumes that the Examiner means that the alleged subcombination is not required for patentability as stated in M.P.E.P. § 806.05(d). The Applicant agrees that the alleged combination and subcombinations are patentable, as the Examiner has already indicated in his previous examination of the claims in the January 15, 2008 Office Action. However, the Examiner has failed to show that the subcombination can be shown to have utility either by itself or in another materially different combination as required. See M.P.E.P. § 806.05(c). Furthermore, restriction is only proper when there would be a serious burden if restriction were not required, as evidenced by separate classification, status, or field of search. See M.P.E.P. §§ 803, 806.05(c), and 808.02. As mentioned, the Examiner had already examined the present

application and allowed claims from each of the alleged combination and subcombination groups. Thus, the burden on the Examiner must not have been particularly serious. Moreover, in examining the elected claims, the Examiner cites a new reference, Bloomquist. How can the Applicant possibly expect that there was any search burden on the Examiner when the Examiner examined all of the claims, then restricted the claims based on the so-called "serious burden", and now rejects the elected claims based on new found prior art? The Applicant maintains that the Examiner has not illustrated any burden whatsoever. Regardless, the Examiner has failed to provide reasons and/or examples to support conclusions for the restriction. See M.P.E.P. § 803. Restriction, therefore, is not proper and the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's restriction and reinstatement of the withdrawn claims.

Claims 1 - 6

In claim 1, the Applicant recites a method that includes identifying a presentation object to be included in a print job. The method also includes recognizing each combination of presentation parameters associated with each appearance of the presentation object within the print job and rasterizing the presentation object according to each recognized combination of presentation parameters to create a rasterized object for each combination. The method also includes caching each rasterized object in a local storage and utilizing the appropriate rasterized object from storage for printing a portion of the print job requiring inclusion of the presentation object. The Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations recited in allowable claim 4 and the intervening claim 3. Accordingly, claim 1 now recites that the method further includes saving an original version of each at least one presentation object in the local storage, selecting at least one category of blocked errors to be ignored during printing, and if an unblocked error occurs during the rasterization of the at least one presentation object, aborting the rasterization whereby the presentation object will be rasterized during printing and the unblocked error reported.

The Examiner stated that the language recited in former claim 4 is allowable. For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentable and the Applicant respectfully requests such disposition. Claims 2, 5, and 6 depend from independent claim 1 and inherit all of the patentable features of the independent claim. Accordingly, claims 2, 5, and 6 are also patentable and the Applicant respectfully requests such disposition.

Claims 7 - 9

In claim 7, the Applicant recites a method that includes identifying at least one presentation object to be included in a print job. The method also includes recognizing each combination of presentation parameters associated with each appearance of the presentation object within the print job. Additionally, the method includes, for each combination, creating a preRIP command identifying the presentation object and the associated presentation parameters. The preRIP command directs a printer to rasterize the identified presentation object according to the identified combination of parameters and to cache the rasterized object for later printing. The method also includes sending each preRIP command to a printer. Claim 7 has been amended to incorporate the language recited in former claim 8 by stating that the method further includes sending blocked error information to the printer to indicate at least one type of error to be ignored during the rasterization process. The amendment also includes language from former claim 4. Based in part on these amendments, the Applicant believes claim is condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 7.

Claim 9 depends from independent claim 7 and inherits all of the patentable features of the independent claim. Accordingly, claim 9 is also patentable and the Applicant respectfully requests such disposition.

Claims 17 - 19

Claim 17 recites a computer readable storage media having embodied thereon computer program instructions effective when executing on a print server to perform the elements recited in amended claim 7. In this regard, claim 18 has been cancelled. The Applicant maintains that the arguments in favor of patentability for claim 7 apply herein and the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance based on those arguments. Claim 19 depends from independent claim 17 and inherits all of the patentable features of the independent claim. For at least these reasons, claim 19 is also patentable and the Applicant respectfully requests such disposition.

New Claim 41

New claim 41 recites a method that includes identifying at least one presentation object to be included in a print job, recognizing each combination of presentation parameters associated with each appearance of the at least one presentation object within the print job, rasterizing the at least one presentation object according to each recognized combination of presentation parameters to create a rasterized object for each such combination, caching each rasterized object in a local storage, and utilizing the appropriate rasterized object from storage when printing a portion of the print job requiring inclusion of the at least one presentation object. The combination of presentation parameters used to rasterize the at least one presentation object includes a subset of the presentation parameters needed for inclusion of the object in the print job. The step of utilizing includes modifying the rasterized object to conform with at least one additional presentation parameter prior to including the rasterized object in the print job. The method also includes storing the modified rasterized object in the local storage with a modified presentation parameter identifier including the at least one additional presentation parameter.

The Examiner stated that claim 5 is allowable if rewritten in independent form. This new claim 41 recites the language of independent claim 1 prior to amendment incorporating the language of claim 5 thereby overcoming the Examiner's objection to claim 5. Claim 5 is therefore allowable and the Applicant respectfully requests such disposition.

Conclusion

Claims 1, 2, 5 - 7, 9, 17, 19, and 41 are believed to be distinguished over the prior art of record. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and the objections. The Applicant also respectfully requests a new Office Action that addresses the Applicant's traversal of the Examiner's restriction requirement. The Applicant believes fees, submitted herewith, are due in this matter in the amount of \$220 for the addition of one independent claim. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/12/2008

/ Gregory T. Fettig /
Gregory T. Fettig (Reg. No. 50,843)
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)